



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,139	01/16/2004	Eric B. Cummings	33532/US	7218
7590	07/03/2007		EXAMINER	
Edward W. Bulchis DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 3400 Seattle, WA 98101			VATHYAM, SUREKHA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1753	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/760,139	CUMMINGS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Surekha Vathyam	1753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 2 April 2007. These drawings are not acceptable. Specifically Fig. 3 has been changed to not only remove the reference character "200" not found in the specification (objected to in the Non-Final action mailed on 27 November 2006), but also to remove reference characters "201", "202" and "203" which were depicted in Fig. 3 as originally filed and described in the specification in page 7, paragraph [025]. The drawings filed on 2 April 2007 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference sign(s) "201", "202" and "203" mentioned in the description.
2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 –11 and 14 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Line 6 of independent claim 1 and recites the limitation "that avoids suppressing electroosmotic flow in the device" and line 8 of independent claim 14 recites the limitation "while avoiding suppression of electroosmotic flow of the sample fluid". Lines 1 and 2 of claim 20 recite the limitation "wherein the act of passing the sample fluid across the non-uniform array comprises employing electroosmotic flow". No support for these new limitations is found in the specification as originally filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1753

6. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11 and 14 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Austin et al. (US 6,824,664).

Regarding claim 1, Austin ('664) discloses a device comprising: a substrate (14); a non-uniform array of insulating features on the substrate (see Figs. 8 and 9 and column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 47); and a plurality of electrodes (28a, 28b) positioned to generate a spatially non-uniform electric field across the non-uniform array (see Fig. 1D and column 8, lines 22 – 34). The statement that "an electroosmosis suppressing agent" is added to a sample in one specific example (column 20, lines 27 – 33) and not in any other part of Austin ('664) disclosure such as in the example described in column 12, lines 40 – 56, is evidence that the device of Austin ('664) inherently avoids suppressing electroosmotic flow unless specifically desired as in the specific example in column 20, lines 27 – 33 where an agent is added to the sample.

Regarding claim 2, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the insulating features vary in size across at least a portion of the substrate (see Figs. 8 and 9, column 7, lines 39 – 43 and column 8, lines 28 – 32).

Regarding claim 3, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the insulating features vary in shape across at least a portion of the substrate (see Figs. 8 and 9, column 7, lines 26 – 31 and column 8, lines 28 – 32).

Regarding claim 4, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein spacing between adjacent features in the array varies across at least a portion of the substrate (column 7, lines 43 – 49 and column 8, lines 28 – 32).

Regarding claim 5, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the insulating features are formed on a wall of a channel or chamber (column 12, lines 5 – 26).

Regarding claim 6, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the substrate comprises glass or polymer (column 5, lines 37 – 44).

Regarding claim 8, Austin ('664) discloses the device further comprising a voltage source (25) connected to the plurality of electrodes (column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 20).

Regarding claim 9, Austin ('664) discloses the device further comprising a fluid port (22 and 30) connected to the channel or chamber (column 10, lines 37 – 49).

Regarding claim 10, "the manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself" *In re Cassey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967), and "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). Nonetheless, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the spatially non-uniform electric field generated across the insulating features exerts a dielectrophoretic force on at least one of said particles (see Figs. 3A – 3D and column 12, line 40 – column 13, line 18).

Regarding claim 11, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein said particles comprise particles selected from the group consisting of bacteria, cells and viruses (column 11, lines 13 – 35).

Regarding claim 14, Austin ('664) discloses a method for manipulating particles using dielectrophoresis (column 4, lines 43 – 55), the method comprising: passing a sample fluid containing the particles across a non-uniform array of insulating features (column 17, lines 30 – 33 and column 18, lines 1 – 6); generating a spatially non-uniform electric field (column 18, lines 7 – 10), the spatially non-uniform electric field exerting a dielectrophoretic force on the particles thereby constraining motion of at least one particle (column 17, lines 32 – 38); and trapping at least one particle at a location in the non-uniform array (column 17, lines 38 – 48), wherein the location is determined at least in part based on electric and geometrical properties of the particle (column 18, lines 11 – 18). The statement that "an electroosmosis suppressing agent" is added in one specific example (column 20, lines 27 – 33) and not in any other part of Austin ('664) disclosure such as in the example described in column 12, lines 40 – 56, is evidence that suppression of electroosmotic flow of the sample fluid is avoided in the method of Austin ('664) unless specifically desired as in the specific example in column 20, lines 27 – 33.

Regarding claim 15, Austin ('664) discloses the method further comprises trapping a first group of particles having a first dielectrophoretic mobility at a first location in the non-uniform array and a second group of particles having a second dielectrophoretic mobility at a second location in the non-uniform array (column 17, lines 52 – 62).

Regarding claim 16, Austin ('664) discloses the method wherein the act of passing the sample fluid across the non-uniform array comprises electrokinetic

transport, advection, sedimentation, buoyancy, or magnetophoresis (column 10, lines 37 – 49).

Regarding claim 17, Austin ('664) discloses the method further comprising changing the spatially non-uniform electric field such that the dielectrophoretic force on the first particle is decreased; and transporting the first particle to a second location in the non-uniform array; and trapping the first particle at the second location (column 17, lines 38 – 48 and column 18, lines 7 – 47).

Regarding claim 18, Austin ('664) discloses the method further comprising: changing the spatially non-uniform electric field such that the dielectrophoretic force on the first particle is decreased; and transporting the first particle to an outlet port (column 17, lines 38 – 48).

Regarding claim 19, Austin ('664) discloses the method wherein the act of passing the sample fluid across the non-uniform array comprises employing electrokinetic transport (column 10, lines 37 – 49).

Regarding claim 20, Austin ('664) discloses the method wherein the act of passing the sample fluid across the non-uniform array comprises employing electroosmotic flow (column 10, lines 37 – 49 and column 12, lines 40 – 56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 7, 12, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. (US 6,824,664) in view of Christel et al. (US 6,368,871).

Austin ('664) discloses a device as discussed with regards to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 7, Austin ('664) discloses the device wherein the insulating features comprise an insulating material supported by an insulating material (column 5, lines 37 – 44 and column 11, line 36 – column 12, line 26) and does not explicitly disclose the supporting material being non-insulating.

Christel ('871) teaches insulating features comprising an insulating material supported by a non-insulating material (column 7, lines 49 – 54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the device of Austin ('664) to include the non-insulating material taught by Christel ('871) to support the insulating material of Austin ('664) because Christel ('871) explains that it helps create a capacitance structure with a surface that is non-conductive and therefore can be used for the extraction, purification and concentration of nucleic acids from a complex biological sample (column 7, lines 53 – 57). Both Austin ('664) and Christel ('871) disclose a device for and method of manipulating particles based on dielectrophoresis using a substrate and a non-uniform array of insulating features on the substrate. See Austin ('664) column 4, lines 43 – 55, column 17, lines 30 – 33 and column 18, lines 1 – 10. See also Christel ('871) column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 15, column 7, line 10 – column 8, line 13).

Regarding claim 12, Austin ('664) discloses a device comprising: a substrate (14); an array of insulating features on the substrate (see Figs. 8 and 9 and column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 47); and a plurality of electrodes (28a, 28b) positioned to generate a spatially non-uniform electric field across the array of insulating features (see Fig. 1D and column 8, lines 22 – 34). Austin ('664) does not explicitly disclose the array is a radial array.

Christel ('871) teaches a radial array (see Fig. 8 and column 7, lines 37 – 49) and teaches that the arrangement of insulating features in the array is a result effective variable for optimization (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified the device of Austin ('664) to make the array be a radial array as taught by Christel ('871) because as Christel ('871) explains the size and shape of the array and structures in the array are optimized to be consistent with the objective of efficient interaction with target moieties in the fluid sample (column 7, lines 12 – 16). “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Both Austin ('664) and Christel ('871) disclose a device for and method of manipulating particles based on dielectrophoresis using a substrate and a non-uniform array of insulating features on the substrate. See Austin ('664) column 4, lines 43 – 55, column 17, lines 30 – 33 and column 18, lines 1 – 10. See also Christel ('871) column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 15, column 7, line 10 – column 8, line 13).

Regarding claim 13, Austin ('664) further discloses the device wherein the insulating features comprise posts (column 7, lines 26 – 30 and lines 39 – 43 and column 8, lines 28 – 34), and the cross-section of the posts increases as the distance from the point of sample input increases (see Figs. 8 and 9 and column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 47).

Austin ('644) teaches the method as discussed with regards to claim 14 above. Regarding claim 21, Austin ('644) discloses trapping particles along various portions of the non-uniform array of insulating features by tuning the frequency of an AC field along the array and trapping particles based on particle size and geometry of the array (column 17, lines 38 – 48) but does not explicitly disclose the non-uniform array comprising a radial array or that the method further comprises trapping particles in a ring around a center of the radial array.

Christel ('871) teaches a method for manipulating particles using dielectrophoresis (column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 15) using a radial non-uniform array of insulating features (see Fig. 8 and column 7, lines 37 – 49) and teaches that the arrangement of insulating features in the array is a result effective variable for optimization (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 1). Christel ('871) also teaches trapping particles along the array by tuning an AC field along the array (column 8, line 64 – column 9, lines 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Austin ('644) to include a radial non-uniform array as taught by Christel ('871) because as Christel ('871) explains the size and shape of the array and structures in the array are optimized to be consistent with the objective of efficient interaction with target moieties in the fluid sample (column 7, lines 12 – 16). “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The method of Austin ('644) comprising trapping particles

along different parts of the array based on the arrangement of insulating features in the array and tuning an AC field would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art to have trapped particles in a ring around a center of a radial array. Both Austin ('664) and Christel ('871) disclose a device for and method of manipulating particles based on dielectrophoresis using a substrate and a non-uniform array of insulating features on the substrate. See Austin ('664) column 4, lines 43 – 55, column 17, lines 30 – 33 and column 18, lines 1 – 10. See also Christel ('871) column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 15, column 7, line 10 – column 8, line 13).

Double Patenting

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1753

12. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 – 7, 14, 16 – 17, 19 – 22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,014,747 in view of Austin et al. (US 6,824,664).

Specifically, instant claim 1 is rejected as unpatentable over each of dependent claims 4, 17, 20 and 22. Instant claim 3 is rejected as unpatentable over each of claims 5 – 7, instant claim 5 over each of claims 1, 14, 19 and 21, instant claim 9 over each of claims 1, 14, 19 and 21 and instant claim 10 over each of claims 1, 14, 19 and 21.

Regarding instant claim 1, dependent claims 4, 17, 20 and 22 of US patent No. 7,014,747 each recite all the limitations except for the explicit disclosure of non-uniform arrays.

Austin ('664) teaches non-uniform arrays of insulating features (see Figs. 8 and 9 and column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the device of US patent No. 7,014,747 to include non-uniform arrays of insulating features as taught by Austin ('664) because it helps trap different lengths of DNA at different parts of the array based on different sizes of DNA in a sample as explained by Austin (column 17, line 29 – column 18, line 47).

13. Claims 1, 6 and 14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 – 5 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,204,923 in view of Austin et al. (US 6,824,664).

Specifically instant claim 1 is rejected over each of claims 1 and 8, instant claim 6 over each of claims 4 and 5 and instant claim 14 is rejected over claim 1.

Regarding instant claims 1 and 14, each of claims 8 and 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,204,923 disclose all the limitations of the device and method recited in the instant claims except for the explicit disclosure of non-uniform arrays.

Austin ('664) teaches non-uniform arrays of insulating features (see Figs. 8 and 9 and column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method and device of U.S. Patent No. 7,204,923 to include non-uniform arrays of insulating features as taught by Austin ('664) because it helps trap different lengths of DNA at different parts of the array based on different sizes of DNA in a sample as explained by Austin (column 17, line 29 – column 18, line 47).

14. Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 11 14, 16 and 19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 – 6, 8, 17 – 21 of copending Application No. 10/678,603.

Specifically, instant claims 1 – 3 are rejected as unpatentable over claim 1, instant claim 6 over each of claims 3 and 4, instant claim 7 over claim 5, instant claim 8 over claim 6, instant claim 9 over claim 8, instant claim 10 over claim 17, instant claim 11 over claim 18, instant claim 14 over claim 19, instant claim 16 over each of claims 20 and 21 and instant claim 19 over claim 20. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the indicated claims

of co-pending application No. 10/678,603 include all the limitations of the corresponding indicated instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

15. Claims 1 – 3 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 – 7 and 46 – 47 of copending Application No. 10/969,137.

Specifically, instant claim 1 is rejected as being unpatentable over dependent claim 3, instant claim 2 over claim 7, instant claim 3 over each of claims 4 – 6 and instant claim 14 over each of claims 46 and 47. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the indicated claims of co-pending application No. 10/969,137 include all the limitations of the corresponding indicated instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2 April 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that Austin ('644) does not disclose a device "that avoids suppressing electroosmotic flow in the device" is not persuasive. The statement that "an electroosmosis suppressing agent" is added to a sample in one specific example (column 20, lines 27 – 33) and not in any other part of Austin ('664) disclosure such as in the example described in column 12, lines 40 – 56, is evidence that the device of

Austin ('664) inherently avoids suppressing electroosmotic flow unless specifically desired as in the specific example in column 20, lines 27 – 33 where an agent is added to the sample.

Regarding applicant's remarks that there is insufficient motivation to combine the teachings of Austin ('664) with Christel ('871), both Austin ('664) and Christel ('871) disclose a device for and method of manipulating particles based on dielectrophoresis using a substrate and a non-uniform array of insulating features on the substrate. See Austin ('664) column 4, lines 43 – 55, column 17, lines 30 – 33 and column 18, lines 1 – 10. See also Christel ('871) column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 15, column 7, line 10 – column 8, line 13). In addition both Austin ('664) and Christel ('871) disclose trapping particles along various portions of the non-uniform array of insulating features by tuning the frequency of an AC field along the array and trapping particles. See Austin ('664) column 17, lines 38 – 48 and Christel ('871) column 8, line 64 – column 9, lines 2.

Applicant's argument that Christel ('871) does not teach a radial array is not persuasive. Christel ('871) teaches a radial array (see Fig. 8 and column 7, lines 37 – 49) and teaches that the arrangement of insulating features in the array is a result effective variable for optimization (column 7, line 64 – column 8, line 1). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified the device of Austin ('664) to make the array be a radial array as taught by Christel ('871) because as Christel ('871) explains the size and shape of the array and structures in the array are optimized to be consistent with the objective of efficient interaction with target moieties in the fluid sample (column 7, lines 12 – 16). “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are

disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Surekha Vathyam whose telephone number is 571-272-2682. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SV/
June 28, 2007



NAM NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700